

LANDSCAPE MEMORANDUM

**RE: Revised Landscape Development Concept June 2021
23 and 25 Te Karita Road, Moeraki
Environmental Consultants Ltd (C Keogh and J Corson)**



1 Introduction

ASLA undertook a landscape and visual assessment of a proposal for development of 23 & 25 Te Karita Road in 2020/2021 on behalf of the Waitaki District Council. The Applicant is Environmental Consultants Ltd (C Keogh and J Corson). The assessment is contained in a report to the Council dated January 2021.

A revised landscape development concept has been provided by the Applicant, received on June 18 2021 through Melissa Shipman. ASLA has been asked to review the proposed plan and set of conditions and advise of any consequential changes to the assessment.

2 Changes to the Proposals

A number of changes have been made to the proposal compared to the proposal received on January 18 2021 which formed the basis of the ASLA assessment. They are as follows:

1. The proposed 500m² building platform is slightly higher up the north face of the knoll, the upper edge moving from the 52m contour up to the just under the 53m contour.
2. The maximum proposed building height has increased from 54.5m above datum to 55m.
3. The height of a future building has increased by .5m (previously FFL was set at 50.5 and max. roof height at 54.5m; now proposed FFL is 50.5m and max. roof height is proposed to be no higher than 55m ad)
4. The maximum floor area of the proposed dwelling (250m²) is slightly more but the building size is still modest
5. The proposed earth mounding to the west of the dwelling and curtilage is no longer proposed
6. The shed closest to the proposed dwelling has been removed.
7. The shed on the west side of the central knoll is now represented by a 170m² building platform but is limited to the same 72m² floor area; it is also slightly lower on the knoll
8. A curtilage area of similar area has been added above and behind the shed, containing the water tank. A curtilage area is also defined for the new dwelling.
9. The lowest shed next to Te Karita Road is also now proposed to be within a 100m² building platform but would be limited to a 34m² floor area rather than 72m².
10. Total building footprint on the site is reduced from 450m² to 400m².
11. The maximum LRV for roofs and exterior cladding is proposed to be 40% (minimum 10%).
12. A condition is proposed that land use east of a line drawn north-south through the site running 5m east of the highest point of the central knoll, is limited to ecological restoration and/or pastoral farming.
13. Planting –
 - a. Planting of trees and shrubs previously proposed wrapping around the northeast and east sides of the central knoll is no longer proposed.
 - b. A new band of planting is proposed across the lower east slope of the central knoll to the east of the proposed dwelling (hebe, *Coprosma repens*, toe toe and flax, with tree planting of Cabbage Tree, Southern Rata, Ngaio and Olearia at spacings wider than 2m).
 - c. The native tree planting marked as Kowhai on the January plan to west of proposed dwelling is a slightly different shape and now comprises Kowhai, Cabbage Tree, Southern Rata, Ngaio, Lemonwood, Five Finger.

- d. New belts of planting of native shrubs and trees similar to other areas are now proposed below the boundary between the two properties and all the way along the north boundary and all along the internal boundary flanking the access drive.

- 14. A condition is proposed that no building consent can be issued for the dwelling until all planting shown on the plan is successfully established; and all planting must be carried out at a density that achieves has a full canopy closure within 5 years.

3 Assessment of Effect of Proposals on Revised Plan Compared to Effects of January Proposed Landscape Development Plan

ASLA noted there would be initial and short term adverse visual and landscape effects due to the potential for the dwelling and the nearby shed to appear prominently on the sealine/skyline in views looking generally east across the site but noted that in time the planting proposed would largely mitigate that effect.

Some of the planting that would have formed a backdrop to the dwelling mitigating this effect has been removed (planting on the northeast “corner” of the central knoll). New planting is proposed further east on a lower elevation (48-50m above datum mostly). The shrub species proposed in Mix D will not grow high enough provide a backdrop and the tree species in the mix will provide a low backdrop approaching roof height but are unlikely to appear higher than the roofline sufficiently to meaningfully absorb it by providing a backdrop. This effect is slightly increased with the .5m increase in elevation of the proposed dwelling and increase in height, effectively raising the roofline to 55m ad compared to 54.5m as previously proposed.

However, planting to the west of the building will most likely grow to screen out views of the future dwelling (and curtilage) thus mitigating this effect.

The proposed condition that building consent may not be granted until trees and shrubs have 1. established successfully and 2. that canopy closure is to be achieved within 5 years, will also most likely mean they have reached sufficient heights to contain the visual effects of the dwelling (and the upper shed) within 5 years, if planted at spacings of 2m or more as stated on the plan. The sea/skyline effects are likely to be shorter in duration and fragmented before being screened altogether.

However the two conditions proposed when read together do not provide certainty that new buildings would be sufficiently screened from the outset to avoid a short-term adverse visual and landscape effect that is more than minor. The planting would need to substantially screen the roof line of the dwelling to avoid a sea/skyline effect (particularly as there is no backdrop vegetation in views looking east across the site), and to generally screen the dwelling and larger shed so that they have little influence on the existing degree of natural landscape character and openness within the Significant Coastal Landscape from the outset. This could be resolved by delaying any building until the vegetation is sufficiently high and dense enough to achieve this, through a suitably worded condition of consent.

The absence of any mitigation related to the driveway and new shed closest to Te Karita Road was also noted. The proposed planting on the new plan would address this issue. The new planting is unnaturally linear in appearance and will highlight the boundaries. However, this adverse effect is considered to be less than minor and would over time be likely to be softened by additional planting. It is acknowledged that linear planting of native species for shelter, or any other purpose, is a permitted activity. The positive effects of extensive native planting for habitat and connected to other extensive plantings across the site, are also to be considered.

The removal of the proposed earth mounding to the west of the BP is in itself neutral in effect. It does mean however that the planting in Mix F will take longer to achieve screening effect of the dwelling (refer comment above, however).

The slight shift of the 72m² shed on the knoll, a looser exact location within a proposed BP of 170m² and the addition of a curtilage area behind the shed would have no additional degree of adverse effect. My comment on the screening ability of the proposed planting applies here also.

The removal of the shed to the west of the BP reduces the adverse effect of several buildings on landscape character slightly and allows for bulking up of the proposed planting in this area, thus is a positive change.

The total area of native planting proposed is greater than before and is well connected as a framework over the site. This is a positive aspect, increasing habitat and connectivity and protecting the soil. Visual amenity of the site overall will also improve (despite the new residential land use).

ASLA had recommended a limitation of future land uses on the land east of the central knoll to pastoral and/or ecological restoration uses. This is now proposed as a consent notice condition (east of a north-south line 5m east of the highest point of the knoll) and is supported. This line needs to be marked on the plan.

The proposed condition to allow LVR for roofing and cladding materials to 40% is not supported. Once the native planting grows around the buildings they will provide a darker context than the existing open pastureland. An upper LRV limit of 20% for roofing and 25% for cladding is recommended to ensure wall and roof planes are absorbed into the surrounding native plant foliage. The 10% lower limit is supported.

The proposed condition 9 is supported in part. It should also apply to the larger shed.

Condition 10 is supported insofar as it is intended to ensure a time-bound density outcome. In order to ensure the short term adverse effects of a visible dwelling and larger shed, an additional condition should be included that requires planting in Mix D and E on the north boundary; in Mix A and B on the internal boundary; and in Mix C on the knoll to have reached sufficient height and density so that the buildings from the outset have negligible visibility and vegetation and/or landform only form the sea/skyline. Negligible visibility is defined as, at most, only a few very small parts of roofs and/or walls can be glimpsed through foliage and overall the buildings are inconsequential in forming the landscape character of the site and wider landscape.

It is noted there is no condition requiring any plants that die, get damaged or fail to thrive are replaced in the next planting season and that no plants may be topped, thinned or otherwise restricted in growth to prevent their normal height and spread. It is recommended a condition be included to cover this, to ensure the planting is maintained in perpetuity.

Overall, the revised proposal is considered to have better landscape outcomes and would have less than minor adverse effects on visual amenity and landscape character, providing the LRV limits are included as recommended, and recommended conditions about delaying building until vegetative screening is in place and plant replacement are included.



Anne Steven
Registered Landscape Architect
22 June 2021